

N00204.AR.002636  
NAS PENSACOLA  
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES 30 NOVEMBER 2010 NAS  
PENSACOLA FL  
11/30/2010  
NAS PENSACOLA

***Minutes***  
**NAS Pensacola RAB Meeting**  
**Naval Air Station Pensacola**  
**Pensacola, Florida**  
*November 30, 2010*

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met at Building 624 on NAS Pensacola on November 30, 2010:

Greg Campbell (Navy Co-Chair)  
Lisa Minchew (RAB Citizen Member)  
Patty Whittemore (Navy RPM)

David Grabka (FDEP)  
Greg Fraley (USEPA)

Administrative and technical support for the meeting was provided by:

Gerry Walker, Tetra Tech  
Amber Igoe, Tetra Tech

Ron Kotun, Tetra Tech  
Frank Lesesne, Tetra Tech

**Welcome:** Greg Campbell, the Navy RAB Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 5:40 pm. Mr. Campbell welcomed everyone and presented the topics to be discussed: Proposed Plan for Site 45.

Lisa Minchew asked about oil coming onto the base. Greg mentioned that his boss is in charge of the cleanup and that divers are going out to assess the plume and will have barges outfitted with cranes to dig up contamination. It is an ongoing operation.

**Technical Presentation:**

Gerry Walker began the presentation for the Proposed Plan for Operable Unit 21 Site 45—Building 603 Lead Site. The presentation is attached. Some highlights of the presentation include:

- Site 45 is the former 603 location and was identified during Site 18 PCB investigation. It is currently paved parking area with some unpaved areas.
- During the investigations Site 18 lead concentrations detected in soils increased the further you got away from the site, therefore the Navy decided to create a new site designated Site 45.
- The remedial Investigation was completed in 2009 and included 3 phases, soil screening (surface and subsurface), soil delineation (surface and subsurface), and groundwater delineation.
- The Feasibility Study was finalized 2010.
- Figures indicating the areas of soil and groundwater contamination exceeding the regulatory standards were presented.
- Surface soil, subsurface soil and groundwater were all included as Medias of concern.

- Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) are goals that a cleanup plan should achieve based on current and reasonably anticipated future land use. Three RAOs were identified including:
  - 1), prevent harm to site workers for soil,
  - 2) prevent human health risk to hypothetical future resident for soil, and
  - 3) prevent human health risk for future receptors for groundwater
- Separate Human Health Risk assessments were completed following FDEP and EPA methodologies.

Lisa asked if the drills and exercises performed by sailors and students were taken into account in the risk assessment. Gerry replied that the site area is primarily paved so the risk is limited and students are transient so they wouldn't be exposed for long periods of time.

- A screening level Ecological Risk Assessment was also conducted. However because the area is generally paved and lacks suitable habitat the ecological risk is very minimal and no action is required.
- The Remedial Alternatives were presented and included four soil alternatives and three groundwater alternatives including:

Soil: S-1 No Action; S-2 In-situ treatment of lead and Land Use Controls (LUCs); S-3 Cover over unpaved areas containing Chemicals of Concern (COCs) exceeding FDEP industrial cleanup levels and combined LUCs; S-4 excavation of soils exceeding industrial cleanup levels and LUCs

Groundwater: GW-1 No Action; GW-2 Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) and LUCs; GW-3 in-situ groundwater treatment, groundwater monitoring and LUCs.
- The remedial alternatives were explained in detail.

Lisa asked if the groundwater would be expected to naturally attenuate within 5 years? Gerry replied yes it is expected to be completed within 5 years. The covered or paved areas will eliminate infiltration through the surface and there will be lower concentrations in the groundwater. Lisa asked if we know when the original spill occurred. Greg Campbell replied that we really don't know the source, so we don't know the time frame of the original spill. Greg Fraley commented that 5 year review would reveal whether or not this selected remedy is working.

- Federal regulations require that each remedy be evaluated against nine specific evaluation criteria. The remedy evaluations were included in the presentation.
- Based on the nine evaluation criteria Remedial Alternatives S-3 and GW-2 were selected. Lisa asked what is used to cover the site area. Gerry replied that the cover will be asphalt paving.
- For soils the asphalt cover and LUCs will limit exposure and prohibit residential development.

Lisa asked if paving the area will affect the trees onsite. Frank Lesesne answered that the trees would be unaffected. Gerry indicated on a site figure the areas to be paved are distant from the existing trees onsite.

- For groundwater Natural attenuation is the preferred alternative with monitoring and LUCs.

Lisa asked that if Alternative GW-3 for groundwater is only approximately \$150K more than GW-2 and would eliminate the risk, why not go with Alternative GW-3? Frank responded that if you used in-situ treatment you'd have to change aquifer conditions to bind contaminant to soil, but if the geochemistry changes the contamination that was bound to the soils could re-enter into groundwater. Dave Grabka also replied that the big difference is 1<sup>st</sup> year capital outlay costs, the State has the default criteria that if it falls within 10 times the Groundwater Cleanup Target Level then MNA can be tried for first five years.

## Conclusion

At the conclusion of the Site 45 Proposed Plan presentation Lisa approved the proposed remedy for Site 45.

No additional RAB meeting plans were made and the meeting adjourned at 6:20 pm.